

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/936,503	09/13/2001	Robert-Peter Klein	512100-2022	6117	
20999	7590 10/22/2003		EXAMINER		
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG			YOUNG, MICAH PAUL		
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. NEW YORK, NY 10151			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,		•	1615	12	
			DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\$	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/936,503 KLEIN ET AL.		
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Micah-Paul Young	1615	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applicate) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl n places the applica	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Officitimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI of extension and the corresponding amounth the shortened statutory period for reply once later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprunt of the fee. The appropriginally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	•	rially reducing or sir	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:	•	·	
Claim(s) rejected: 7-15.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disappr	oved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	.	
10. Other:			
		Micah-Paul Young Examiner	

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the claims remain obviated by the prior art. Applicant argues that the paper of Nichols would create a non-rigid TTS, yet the rigidity of the TTS has not been claims in the instant application. The claims merely recite that the supprot material consists of paper. Applicant qualifies this limitation in the specification by disclosing the advantages of absorbant paper as a support medium. Nichols discloses a TTS with a support medium of absorbant paper. The fact that Hoffman does not disclose the presene of paper is irreleavent since Hoffman is the reference being modified. If applicant would like to claim the rigidity of the TTS along with other more defining features of the papr support material, applicant is more than welcome. These limitations of course should find support in the specification, and might require a further search.

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600